

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,715	OSBORN, WALTER A.
	Examiner Matthew O Savage	Art Unit 1723

**All Participants:**

(1) Matthew O Savage. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Ken Pedersen. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2004

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*5, 6, and new claims 7 and 8*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Prior art of record.*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to cancel claim 5 of which, upon reconsideration was considered obvious over Dixon in view of Sticher et al. Agreed to amend claim 6 to patentably distinguish over Dixon and to clarify the location of various elements recited in the claim in relation to each other. Agreed to add new claims 7 and 8 covering the details of the pick-up assembly and discharge tube, respectively. See the attached examiner's amendment for details..